8. Political Commitment as a Symptom of Mental Weakness

> I have discovered that there is no man who, no matter how strongly he demands freedom for himself, does not also wish to subject the will of others in society to his own.
>
> *The Vicar of Wakefield*. Olivier Goldsmith

Individual weakness, strength of the collective; arrogance and the distribution of power, submission and self-serving conviction, misery, misery, and more misery. There is everything in the way we sketch our imago mundi within our propióspheres. Addicted to imposition, confident in the strength that numbers provide, we are incapable of freeing ourselves from animality when our survival depends on it. Just like hyenas, chimpanzees, or piranhas, we move in groups against the solitary individual because we instinctively know that there is power in the group. And we have known this since our species first set foot on the face of the Earth. We are animals draped in elaborate rituals, and in our imagination—sick with anthropocentrism—we believe that nature owes us something, when in fact, nature cares very little about our existence.

Abstract thought, this beautiful coincidence that nature itself has given us since we learned to use our hands, is perhaps the only thing that separates us from animality.

Let us examine here one of the greatest sorrows that corrodes our existence. The profound meaning of our lives—that holy grail, promised and offered at the cost of our souls—is the great reward with which ideological thought promises to bless us, yet it constantly slips away from our grasp.

We like to think of ideology as a complex phenomenon, exclusive to large structures: nations, religions, political parties, schools of thought. But its logic is so ancient and essential that it can exist even within a minimal community. We need no more than a few wills in conflict over opposing interests for ideology to arise—almost spontaneously—with its promise of meaning, group pressure, submission, and the illusion of belonging. That is why I will now propose a simplified model: two minimal communities, each with three wills, and one external will seeking to join.

The community we shall call 'Community A' will be composed of the wills vA_1, vA_2 y vA_3. The community we shall call 'Community B' will be composed of the wills vB_1, vB_2 y vB_3.

In relation to these minimal communities, we can also imagine a will that acts—according to the scheme of domination I examined in a previous lecture ('On the Exercise of Domination Through Cruelty', 03/05/2025)—as a petitioner or applicant seeking to join them. This will, which requests entry into Community A (arbitrarily chosen by me, as it could just as well seek entry into B), we shall call vx ('will x').

vx initially belongs neither to Community A nor to Community B, but wishes to join Community A. Ideally, Communities A and B are also rivals; they compete for resources while confronting opposing worldviews.

Conditioning

No one would believe that vx seeks to join Community A for no reason. The first step is to try to understand why it must pursue the protection of a community—any community. At first, the idea that there is simply a total alignment between the chosen community's purposes and those of vx is tempting, even commonsensical. Thus, vx merely says, 'Community A represents me', and then, 'I will fight for the

ideals of Community A because they are also my ideals'. Upon entering the community and transitioning from vx to vA_4, it will receive a series of benefits, which will come bundled with a more or less discreet package of obligations.

That 'total alignment' is, above all, a rhetorical device. And it functions as such both when explaining a decision to belong and when making the decision itself. We know that the complexity of the priorities and principles that sustain a community and those that sustain any individual will rarely coincide absolutely; and even if such coincidence were to exist momentarily, communities (as collective wills) and individualities inevitably change.

Therefore, dissent is inevitable.

If we choose to reject passivity and the comfort of the argument of mere coincidence, we will enter a jungle of intellectual miseries that challenge our ability to be honest about our own insignificance. The first thing to acknowledge is that there is likely a prior conditioning by an authority figure to whom we submit—a dominant interpretation of the world that structures reality within vx's propiosphere even before it conceives the idea of joining Community A. In that structure, it is no less 'true' that Community A represents the best way of being in the world, of existing, while Community B is mistaken or deceitful. The possible variations of this litany are endless. What is striking, from an external point of view, is that vx never considers the possibility that Community A might be wrong or distorting reality, and that perhaps Community B could eventually be right. This ideological shielding of worldview is the closest thing to blindness. But it is a special kind of blindness—voluntary, chosen—and one that, apparently, it is both possible and gratifying to feel proud of.

The conviction created and even inherited by vx that it is right in seeking entry into Community A—because it also holds prior convictions, freely chosen at least in appearance—is curiously completed by the conviction that Community B is systematically wrong; and not only wrong, but intentionally falsifying reality. It does so because its primary values are bad—or rather, it has no values at all. Hence, the dichotomy between good and evil is indispensable to bear the weight of the structure that leads to ideology and political commitment.

Then, having assimilated the intrinsic perspective of Community A and forming a judgment from that position, Community B will be systematically condemned to carry the banner not only of error or falsification but—more importantly—of evil, in a divided universe over which ideological thought runs like a computer program as a system. Thus, for vA_4 (formerly vx), reality will be reduced to an evident order with, on one side of the boundary, those who act driven by a primordial goodness (Community A) and, on the other, those who act driven by an equally primordial evil (Community B).

The difference between error and evil will be marked by the attribution of cynicism or hypocrisy—that is, falseness. Behind error, there is nothing but a mistaken assessment of the conditions of existence, but behind evil, those conditions are evaluated as intentionally crafted strategies. It is curious that evil itself proves unsustainable. Being evil for the sake of being evil seems like a very precarious way to justify the actions of a character, but also of a person. Is anyone evil just because, simply for being evil? Reduced to a very basic mathematical metaphor, addition within a community determined by an ideological factor always yields the same value: 2 + 2 = 4, but also 1 + 1 = 4, 1 + 2 = 4, and so forth. And '4' can be seen as the figurative representation of the statement 'Community B maliciously falsifies reality'... And we know very well that Community B will not always falsify reality, nor will Community A always be right. Thus, an admirable paradox is created: ideological thought as a system is itself a way of falsifying reality. It is also tendentious insofar as what interests it is nothing other than keeping the community united, existing, and providing benefits. It is evident that those who obtain the greatest

benefits from the organization will be the ones who most ardently insist that the outcome of the operation is always 4.

As the benefits become less obvious—that is, for the most dispensable militants—the motivation seems less clear. But one must not underestimate the horror of loneliness and ostracism that can drive the least plausible behaviors; that is, committing crimes in the name of a cause or losing contact with friends and even close family because of the colors of a flag and a handful of slogans.

I have denied the idea of the absurd on other occasions. I have maintained that there is always a rational reason for everything we do. And I am convinced of that. Reality is rational. Even if we do not share or validate another's reasons, they are there; we can see them and even understand them. But if there were a boundary separating the rational from the absurd, surely these radical behaviors would lie precisely there. It is a complete inability to grasp scale, a criminal innocence, a monstrous weakness that drags the individual into dissolution within the crude, aggressive mass chanting an empty slogan, whose sole purpose is mutual shelter and the exercise of force—both symbolic and physical—against a fetishized enemy.

Right and left are the same; hatred and fear.

When Dante Alighieri abhorred the indifferent, he knew they were aware of his secret, his weakness, and had not fallen into that so obvious and pathetic trap that had conditioned the life of the Florentine: political commitment.

It is undeniable that one of the most common fears is that of loneliness. Perhaps this is because we are convinced that we need others and, closely related to that, that we are weak. The moment we conceive ourselves as weaknesses, we begin to see in which areas and in what ways we are weak, and why. It is like wandering around the walls of our *egoic* castle, horrified by the realization of how easily some parts crumble. Thus, it is easy and commonsensical to understand the need to be sheltered by groups that will defend us if needed. That weakness, as I have said before, is nothing other than the origin of our ordinary tragedy ('The Origin of Ordinary Tragedy', 04/19/2025). And not only the weakness itself but our fear that it will betray us and have terrible consequences. The fear of being left alone is natural since from childhood we have depended on others. And even in adulthood, we know that, by virtue of how society is structured, our independence will always be an illusion.

On the other hand, regarding those who wholeheartedly dedicate themselves to a cause sustained by a community (for example, vx transformed into vA_4), we see them lose their individuality, merging their thinking with that of the collective, adjusting discrepancies to remain within the group, enjoying the benefits they receive, and complying. And here appears another exquisite paradox: while they dissolve into the group and sacrifice their individuality and thought, they use the community's slogans, repeating them like a mantra to anchor themselves and define themselves in the world as relevant actors. Arguing with them is to fall into an obvious trap. They have all the answers because having them means knowing how to defend the ideological hive to which they belong.

Commitment, passion, and militant virulence are nothing but insecurity dressed in language and gestures.

If we remove from the scheme malice, convenience, and the need to consolidate bonds for spurious reasons such as economic, sexual, or power benefits, and focus on that acolyte who offers themselves wholeheartedly and sincerely yet receives only crumbs, we can only attribute such behavior to innocence or folly.

Fanaticism is not only about militancy to the point of delirium and violence; it is not merely about tying a flag around one's neck and shouting a pseudo-warrior chant. Nor is it the fervent prayer with tightly shut eyes, repetitive and monotonous. If it were, we could feel fairly safe. But no. Fanaticism infects all social structures like a plague and conditions the way people interpret reality on a level that influences appearance, feelings, reasoning, attitudes, gestures, relationships, tastes, language, habits, and even reflexive reactions.

Homogeneity as a problem

We have already seen how, conditioned, vx transformed into vA_4 upon entering Community A. But is it possible that the operation always yields 4? Will the members of Community B always be in error or falsifying reality? No one is infallible, nor is a community; therefore, Community A will eventually be wrong or distort reality. And that is where a loyalty comes into play that is a symptom of fanaticism and folly. vx, now transformed into vA_4, will align with the rest of the community in defending the error or falsification asserted by Community A. What truly binds a community? A set of assertions about reality, memories, idealizations. vA_4 may argue that people are not infallible but that values transcend individuals, creating with this argument an imaginary reality—a creed—in which the faults of vA_1, vA_2, and vA_3 are covered by the banner of the transcendent and immortal values of Community A.

This is nothing but fanaticism in action; falling back on a single interpretation of reality provides security to the weakest souls and generates alliances, friendships, comradeships, and also shared hatreds that help those weak souls find footing in a world that would otherwise be chaos. The passage from cosmos to chaos within the climate of the propiosphere would constitute the utmost misfortune.

No one can live without trusting in something. Give someone a utopia, and you will have their heart.

It is curious and even ridiculous that these blind, vulgar, and violent alliances—revealing petty, mediocre characters prone to intellectual submission—are proclaimed and publicized by the spreaders of imago mundi as rebellion and nonconformity. It is a cruel mockery that remains completely invisible to the committed. Their leaders laugh at them and continue living off their imbecility.

xA_1 fails, so what then?

Then, from vx's (xA_4's) perspective, he is a companion, a fellow believer, a comrade, a friend, a colleague, a brother. How could we stand against him! Doing so would be a betrayal of the ideals of Community A. Because, of course, let us remember that if we take actions contrary to the cohesion of Community A (such as denouncing a fellow member), we are indirectly favoring Community B, the staunch rivals of Community A.

In that case, Community A should ideally choose to expel xA1 from itself. In this way, it avoids the uncomfortable situation of having to defend the indefensible.

It would also be necessary to assess the nature of the fault. A member of Community A can perfectly well remain part of it if the fault does not necessarily harm the ideals upon which the community is built. Indeed, it is quite expected that Community A itself would accuse Community B of having created a conspiracy, a setup, a genuine 'smear campaign' against xA_1 for political reasons.

Of course: I have assumed that xA1 fails, but many members of Community A will accuse me of taking an evidently political stance by doing so.

And not being able to escape…

What would happen if vx did not want to join either Community A or Community B? In an informal conversation with some members of Community A, vx openly expresses: 'I do not wish to belong to

Community A'. 'If you do not belong to Community A', they respond, 'then you belong to Community B'. 'I do not wish to belong to either Community A or Community B', vx repeats. 'There is no possible neutrality', the members of Community A inform him with a look of arrogance. 'You are either with us or with them'. And although it may seem like a parody, an exaggeration with rhetorical intent, the world functions that way. They rob vx—regardless of which community we talk about—of any possibility to remain outside the structure that communities have imposed on the world to understand and manipulate it; to distribute power and dominance. They rob him of his very own 'self'.

And generation after generation, life after life, as if we were beasts of burden for ideology, we fall again into the same misfortune.

The last weakness

Total weakness—the one that leaves no room for amplification, the one that defines us fatally from an ontological standpoint—is the failure to find purpose in existence itself. That is why a source of meaning for existence will be valued immensely. If a community grants meaning to the existence of its members (like walking hand in hand toward a better world, if not for ourselves, then for our children), then belonging becomes more than emotional; it is simultaneously epistemological, ontological, and moral; collective and intimate. The body itself—not just the intangible existence we call the 'soul'—comes to form part of a collective fantasy: a staggering physical mass that moves like a blind and incontrovertible will; a giant, dirty, crawling wart. Standing up to it is a sin; it is arrogance against the most elemental sense through which the weak, the mediocre, the empty defend themselves.

I must not fail to emphasize the consequences of these ideas. The apparent paradox arises from the fact that, historically, members of certain communities have defended the ideals of those communities with their lives. The courage of the militant, then, seems proven. There is nothing to dispute there. But when we demand a little more from reality and question it without letting our vision become clouded by spurious, simplistic reasoning, we realize that real courage, the power of the human being, or true will in the face of existential emptiness is not found in the assumption of collective ideals; rather, it is found in the face-to-face, individual, pure confrontation with infinite ugliness and beauty, with the void of death and the search for purpose; it is also found in the revelatory power of intelligence, of reason; it is also found in the denial of collective movement, of directed taste, of opinions simply assumed without specifying their source or considering their scope.

I do not believe in any human association. The only truth lies in the individual. Every time we join hands to move forward, we end up killing each other; some ‘we’ whom we call ‘they’.

Final annex: of the weak, the worst. The artists

With good reason, it will be said that I intend to leave this world with my words; that I too, like all those I criticize, am weak and need to take refuge under any banner and serve it. But grant me that such a critique as mine must be made from somewhere.

I am also a weak being, but life has placed me in a position where I do not feel particularly indebted to any political discourse. If I believe in democracy, it is because I still keep somewhere in my heart a certain hope in humanity. If I were to lose all hope, then it would be better for me to die than to continue in this world.

But I would like to conclude this reading by speaking about a particularly irritating phenomenon, from my perspective, related to artistic creation and the motivation of artists who use clearly political discourses or their derivatives to sell their work. Because, as you may have already intuited, it is true that the only truth is the market, economic exchange, the illusion of profit. Thus, much of the history of art—

at least of the last century and the current one—has been dominated by what is called 'leftist' thought. This diffuse thinking, founded on various interpretations of Marxist philosophy, inevitably results in a discourse of resistance and liberation. Whether in the realm of love, friendship, or above all, social justice, it is the best way to establish an artistic work since it appeals to an intimate feeling of camaraderie—a camaraderie that promotes and sells.

In the best of cases, these artists lie. In the worst, they are merely weak-minded individuals herding other weak-minded individuals, so that, wrapped in a cloud of weakness and knowing that what they do is deliberately distorting reality, they continue doing it without caring about anything else.

Like a lethal virus, this manifestation of mental weakness has taken hold of art and continues to manipulate it. The artists—soulless flesh—repeat the same slogans generation after generation. They change the idiomatic subtleties, but in an infinite cycle, they keep educating in resentment and violence, shaping people's sensibilities, selling their art while abhorring consumer society. There will be no peace as long as these promoters of weakness continue spreading the germ of discord to transform it into an artistic product and live off our stupidity.